

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

May 9, 2019

Members Present

George Davis
Courtney Nicholas
John Ranson
R.J. Lackey
Jonathan Hackworth

Members Absent

Peyton Keesee

Staff

Ken Gillie
Lisa Jones
Holley Preston
Clarke Whitfield

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

1. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 308 Court Street for installation of 1 door sign and 1 window sign.*

Present on behalf of this request was Jeremy Clifton, owner of Dominion CrossFit. Mr. Clifton stated we would like to paint our door and put something on the window because right now, our door is rusted and people have a hard time locating us.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so the window will say, "Take control of your Health and Fitness Today" and the door will have the Dominion CrossFit, logo.

Mr. Clifton stated yes.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the door sign and the wall sign both meet the guidelines as presented and we issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Hackworth seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

2. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 109 Bridge Street, Suite 600 for a wall light projection system to illuminate the third floor north facing wall of the North Annex with a static display of the Cotton at Riverside Mill logo and a 25" x 60" hot rolled steel sign that reads: "Cotton".*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Ann Dickerson, here on behalf of Cotton at Riverside Mill and the Perry Restaurant Group. Ms. Dickerson stated I just want to say briefly that I am so excited to see all these people here like you are. The last time that I came before you there was only three items on the agenda. This is a great testimony to what you people are doing here. I'm

really here to beg forgiveness it is obvious that we have two signs up that we did not come through the committee for those signs. I can't give you any great excuse why it didn't happen that way. We clearly know how to do it we did it for Muchos and we just didn't do it through Cotton. I apologize and now I'm here to ask for permission for a certificate of appropriateness for these signs.

Mr. Davis stated so these signs are basically already up.

Ms. Dickerson stated not basically, they are definitely. The steel sign, which is your typically flat against the wall, it's a sort of a rust color on the front side with a piece of steel behind it that is right above the outside door of the patio. The other sign illuminated which is only seen at night our hope was to help the people that are coming across the bridge to be able to see where Cotton really is. It is a challenge to know where this restaurant is located and while we have some small signs, a sign in the lobby of the front building it is a challenge to figure out where Cotton is so it was really to help people to understand and find their way. We thought a nice aggressive touch to what is already being done in the River District which maintains the Historical not painted on and it's not flashing "come eat here" it's just a very settle logo.

Mr. Lackey stated why do you feel the need for both signs?

Ms. Dickerson stated because the one by the patio entrance is tiny and you really see that one when you are in the parking lot. It helps you understand where to go up the steps if you are going to go in the back entrance. The other sign you really don't see from the parking lot and you mostly see it from the River.

Mr. Hackworth stated is there a particular reason you opt for the projective sign verses a more historically accurate painted sign logo?

Ms. Dickerson stated I would have to go back and ask but my understanding was that there was not an option to paint. I could be mistaken.

Mr. Lackey stated they might have a problem with the tax credits.

Mr. Hackworth stated well the historic tax credits would have an issue if it were not appropriate for the building. In the year 1882, the building had a painted sign on it.

Ms. Dickerson stated I don't have a good answer for that. I think the intention was to do something very cool and different for the River District.

Mr. Hackworth stated is that actually the largest that metal sign can be?

Mrs. Preston stated the metal sign on the building can be up to 32 square feet.

Mrs. Nicholas stated but right now, that sign is mounted that doesn't look all that big is actually 43 square feet or is that?

Mrs. Preston stated it is 10.4 square feet, the total signage with the light projected one and that one is 43 square feet, which puts it over the 32 total limit.

Ms. Dickerson stated and the lighted one you don't see during the day only at night.

Mr. Davis stated I think we are in a bit of quandary because you have already put the signs up.

Ms. Dickerson stated I understand that.

Mr. Davis stated we are trying to see if it meets not only the guidelines but also, the guidelines that we have set forth and working with other businesses. I kind of agree with Mr. Hackworth had it been more of a sign for that period I don't think we would have much to say about it. This is very different.

Ms. Dickerson stated it is very different and you people would not be the first historical area to have to try to figure this out. I was not involved in it but I know that in Farmville there is also one of these signs. I think this is kind of a way of the future.

Mr. Ranson stated the way that it looks it is historically accurate.

Mr. Hackworth stated my intention was along the lines what can we do within the guidelines to help them as far as visibility verses necessary the lettering. That is why she is here she is looking for visibility.

Ms. Dickerson stated because of visibility we would obviously like to keep the sign and I understand your concern.

Mr. Davis stated may I make a suggestion, how about we table this you have the signs up anyway which will allow us to go by there and look at it.

Mrs. Nicholas stated is it constant projection or can you only see it when the light is down.

Ms. Dickerson stated it is a constant projection but you only see it at night.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lackey made a motion to table this particular agenda item for one month to give the Commissioners time to view the property and signs. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-1 vote.

3. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 406 Cabell Street to construct a masonry entry ramp with metal railing.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Gus Dyer, here on behalf of Danville Historical Society. Mr. Dyer stated I think it's pretty self-evident to speed things up I will ask if you have any questions. Technically, it's not a ramp because it is level it is more of a stoop or a landing. We are going to project it to the right until it reaches grade. The illustration that you have it is a little bit off because we actually hit grade in the middle of that window instead of all the way to the second window.

Mr. Davis stated it will come off to the side?

Mr. Dyer stated it will project out 6 feet and run to the right and it will automatically meet grade. It will allow the sidewalk to come out to the street. It will be a flat area for the entrance to the building. As far as the railing, we don't really care what the railing looks like because you have conflicting guidelines we will probably pick something out that is in the illustration or a picket fence.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the ramp meets guidelines as presented and is allowed to have a railing that is consistent with other railings within the River District currently and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Hackworth second the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

4. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 530 Craghead Street, Unit 200 for conversion of former garage into a restaurant, as follows:*
 - A. *Install four (4) new garage doors: the center two (2) doors will be operable, overhead doors; the extreme left door will be fixed (stationary) except for a 3'0" swinging door and the extreme right door will be a swinging door, approximately 48" wide, both opening out and of similar construction.*
 - B. *Install a stainless steel smoker on the east side ledge.*
 - C. *Alter the existing fence and install a 48" gate, of same construction as the existing fence.*
 - D. *Install a small fence (or gate) to fill the gap between the fence and the smoker.*
 - E. *Install a half-round gutter, across the front and possibly on all four (4) sides, and downspout(s).*
 - F. *Install five (5) gas lamps on the front, one (1) on each column.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Butch Dalton, here on behalf of Grove Park Properties. Everything that we are proposing here has already been approved by the Department of Historic Regulations both State and Federal.

- A. *Install four (4) new garage doors: the center two (2) doors will be operable, overhead doors; the extreme left door will be fixed (stationary) except for a 3'0" swinging door and the extreme right door will be a swinging door, approximately 48" wide, both opening out and of similar construction.*

Mr. Hackworth stated are these doors going to be wooden?

Mr. Dalton stated we are shopping; the wood prices are just astronomical so we are pricing it both ways. Honestly, the first price that we received was ridiculous and we are shopping again.

Mr. Ranson stated could it be either wood or metal?

Mr. Dalton stated it is the owner's preference. Either way they will be painted the same color as the trim on the building now, which is urban bronze.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so I'm looking at the architectural drawing but I'm having trouble understanding what is actually happening.

Mr. Dalton stated this box here is the smoker on the East end of the building.

Mrs. Nicholas stated would that be accessible or would it be put into the building? I'm just not certain.

Mr. Dalton stated we are going to cut it into the building through the cinderr block and slide it out and it will be on a freshly poured concrete pad. It will be fixed into place and it will be blocked into concrete back into place. Next on the list is to alter that fence. We haven't seen it yet but I have seen photos it's basically a stainless box.

Mrs. Nicholas stated there will be no existing gap between the smoker and the physical building itself?

Mr. Dalton stated no it will be inserted through the wall and some kind of door from the inside. We won't know this until we get the smoker on site the proposal is to alter the fence, which is 5 feet wide and 5 feet long, and insert a 48 inch gate either at the beginning or next to the first post and it will open out. There will be another small section fence perpendicular to that. The preference would be to use copper gutters and we are asking for gas lamps, which also be copper and they would match. They would be much smaller than what is on Muchos but the same concept.

Mr. Davis stated according to what the notes are that were written to us Item B is the only one that doesn't measure up to the guidelines that are presented.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that A, C, D, E, and F meet the guidelines as presented and they should issue a Certificiate of Appropriateness as presented within the notes. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Davis stated what was it about the smoker that it wasn't according to guidelines?

Mrs. Preston stated because they are not proposing screening. It is supposed to be screened in. It is considered a piece of equipment. Just like the conservation that we had last month about the transformers and that kind of thing. They are not proposing any screening to screen it from view. It is sort of a unique situation I'm not saying it isn't doable, but the drop off grade completely drops down there are several utilities and electrical transformer and a phone, utility box in that bottom mulch area. The ledge that they are going to use to build upon is not really a place to plant anything because of the grade. Probably is doable to do some kind of fencing to build out the ledge more, but then it would probably eliminate their access to it for maintenance if it is completely built up and screened for view.

Mrs. Nicholas stated is there enough room between the fence addition that is already going on if say a wood screen for example we allowed a wood screen down by Me's would there be enough room for it to be opened or maintenance or any of that. I can't get a sense of how deep that ledge is.

Mrs. Preston stated the ledge is maybe 2 feet?

Mr. Dalton stated its probably 3 to 4 feet its close down to Mucho's and the other building. That would be the highest point.

Mrs. Preston stated they possibly could I don't know if they need access to the piece of equipment and the wooden partition may prevent them from having it.

Mr. Dalton stated I believe that is the reason we are requesting that the gate again I will not know personally until it is sitting here. The reason we asked for a gate they have to have access to that side for maintenance.

Mr. Ranson stated so the guidelines don't cover a smoker.

Mrs. Preston stated they just cover equipment.

Mr. Ranson stated if it were a transformer it would require a screen from view but to me a smoker is something that you would want to see. It is part of the process and it would be interesting to see it. Even though it might not be covered by the guidelines, and I think that it should be acceptable because it is a unique situation.

Mr. Gillie stated you can have outside barbecue grills and there are alot of restaurants that could ask for these and a smoker might be neat this could open a door for alot of other types. That is up to you. We think it is mechanical equipment, the same as a generator or air conditioning system. Equipment is the same as equipment.

Mr. Davis stated you're also looking at the danger aspect you have someone get inside the gate there is a danger.

Mr. Gillie stated the danger is also exposed and they can lean on hot equipment and everything.

Mr. Lackey stated is there a reason that it is not being put inside of the building?

Mr. Dalton stated it is a very small building.

Mr. Lackey stated it is a space issue.

Mr. Dalton stated I think so. I don't think that it is true that you can touch it and burn because it is separated by the gate that we are asking for. We are also putting a fence down on the lower level where the electrical transformer is now so you can't get close enough to touch it. It isn't close enough to touch unless you crawl over a fence.

Mr. Ranson stated will this thing open up and people can put stuff in it?

Mr. Dalton stated there is the access point on that side and I know they are going to open on the inside.

Mr. Ranson stated so the putting in and taking out will be on the inside?

Mr. Dalton stated I assume so yes. They will probably load fuel from the side.

Mr. Ranson stated so what is the rest of the building going to be used for?

Mr. Dalton stated it is going to be a barbecue restaurant, a barbecue shack that is only going to sit eight to ten people. You will also be able to order when you are at Mucho's. They are going to share coolers.

Ms. Dickerson stated I can explain the smoker better. The way the smoker works is that the door on the inside is actually backed up to the inside of the building. The chefs and cooks go and open that door and that is where the meat goes in and out. The outside we need access to because that is where your wood goes to fuel it and that is also where they need access to clean it and pressure wash the smoker.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so it needs to be frequently accessed?

Ms. Dickerson stated yes because you have to put the fuel in and also be able to clean and maintain it.

Mrs. Nicholas stated is there any way that this could be considered an attractive nuisance?

Mr. Whitfield stated if you are looking for a way not to set a precedent the fact of the surroundings and the fact that it will be on a ledge and I may be wrong Mr. Gillie. I can't imagine that there will be many more areas in the River District where you will have a narrow ledge which you would set a smoker. You might be able to talk about the unique circumstances and under constraints of the building and the space of where the smoker is going to be and set that apart from future cases so that it will not set a precedent.

Mr. Gillie stated we have a concern now where is the wood going to be stored? I was not aware that it was going to be a wood fired smoker.

Mr. Dalton stated I don't have an answer to that but I would think that it would be below that ledge. May I add a couple of things a letter that we received from the Design Commission. It says that staff recommends this discrepancy as minor and therefore they approve the issuance of certificate of appropriateness. We are not saying that we are not willing to put up a screen we have to put it where it is movable just like a gate.

Mrs. Nicholas stated that is why I was asking about the depth of the ledge verses the gate.

Mr. Davis stated I would think that we would want it screened then we don't have to worry about setting the precedent. Plus if its going to be a wood fire smoker and you are able to bring up the wood and keep it right beside the smoker and it is handled easily.

Mrs. Nicholas stated but if the ledge is so narrow that could make it impossible to be able to get to the other things that they need to do. I don't want to make it where they have a smoker that they can't use.

Mr. Ranson stated that is their problem.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson stated that Item B does not meet the guidelines as presented. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 5-0 vote.

Mr. Lackey stated my opinion being consistent with the screening is important. If the ledge is an issue they will have to build a deck and access to it. That would be the owners issue not the River District problem. I hope that it won't come to that.

Mrs. Nicholas stated is there efficient space to build out from that?

Mrs. Preston stated I think there is space but there is also the utility boxes that they would essentially cover. I don't know the regulations from the utilities as far as their feelings of something being built on top of it.

Mr. Lackey stated if they came back and said look we can't do it because we have this problem then you would have a City and owner issue and I would be happy to reverse it.

Mr. Davis stated what if we word it if feasible?

Mr. Gillie stated who determines feasibility?

Mr. Whitfield that was going to be my question.

Mr. Gillie stated I really don't want to have that thrown on me.

Mr. Dalton stated this gate that we are asking for again all I have is this drawing. I believe that the smoker is only a little bit higher than the existing fence. The gate that we are asking for there are some sort of solid panels inserted into that gate and the gate would be a foot higher. The gate itself would act as a screen.

Mrs. Nicholas makes a recommendation that Commission considers this discrepancy as minor in Item B and so therefore approves the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness to install the stainless steel smoker on the East side ledge with the addition that the fencing and gate that was altered in Items C and D use trex cladding in order to act as a screen around the smoker. Mr. Hackworth second the motion. The motion was approved by a 3-2 vote.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness for the Craghead Street Tunnel to create an art installation that consists of multi-colored LED lights for a beautiful entry/exit to the River District.

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Traci Petty and Evelyn Riley. Ms. Riley stated we are presenting to the Commissioners today this idea and our dream and bringing that to the River District.

Mr. Ranson stated is this going to be like the Detroit Airport?

Ms. Riley stated yes. Just to be clear the picture does include lights over the driving portion but that is something that this project will not be under taking. It would just be the walkways along adjacent on the sides.

Mr. Hackworth stated what is the reasoning for not including it over the driving portion?

Ms. Riley stated safety.

Mr. Hackworth stated what is the safety issue?

Ms. Riley stated distraction. We didn't want to take a chance and also because of the budget.

Mr. Hackworth stated I don't share your safety concerns.

Mr. Ranson stated when I read about it in the paper it said that you were looking for grants for financing. That is fine but I think once we approve something it has to be done in a limited time.

Mrs. Preston stated in one year.

Ms. Riley stated we plan to have it done by the end of summer.

Mr. Ranson stated so if you don't get your grant by the end of the year you will have to come back.

Mr. Hackworth stated I'm not sure which one of you that I talked to but you do have permission from Norfolk Southern?

Ms. Riley stated yes and they will also be requiring design specification.

Mr. Whitfield stated I just asked that question for staff. They actually have a signature and they signed the application.

Mr. Hackworth stated I know how they can be.

Ms. Riley stated these will be programmed to change the lights and figuration for homecoming and etc.

Mr. Hackworth stated these will be stationary lights they are not going to flash.

Ms. Riley stated ours are similar to this and you can see how these are cut into squares each one of them are a different color and it is a muted soft transition. It's not a strobe.

Mr. Ranson stated it's just like the lights in the research building.

Ms. Riley stated exactly.

Adam Goebel, I am the Executive Director over the Science Center and I have worked down there for 18 years now. Mr. Gold stated I am here to speak on behalf of myself. I just wanted to voice my support on this project.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the request meets the guidelines as presented with the following conditions that the project approval must be obtained from Norfolk Southern prior to the art installation that consists of multi-colored LED lights through the tunnel. The applicants must provide a copy of the Norfolk Southern approval to the City's records and multi-colored lights must not blink, strobe, move or change in such a matter that creates a safety hazard passing through the tunnel so be issued a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Hackworth second the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

6. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 548 Craghead Street for an 18-month extension of a previous application to have recessed signage at street level. Current signage includes rendering and plans for the 500 block as it stood at the time when the initial application was submitted. We wish to update that signage with progress made since that time, as well as, projects coming down the pipeline.*

Mr. David opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Jeffrey Gignac, here on behalf of Rick Barker Properties, LLC. Mr. Gignac stated as the application indicates there has been a lot of changes in the block since the initial signage was approved and displayed. We would like to change that signage to indicate that change and update since that initial signage.

Mr. Davis stated one of the conditions was that the wall be reinforced.

Mr. Hackworth stated that has been done.

Mr. Gignac stated in addition to the new signage we will be painting it with a fresh coat of black paint so it will maintain a sharp appearance.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion that the request complies with the guidelines with the following stipulations each sign may be no larger than 32 square feet and the wall and signage may remain in place up to eighteen months or November 10, 2020. The wall and signage is allowed to remain in place for a period of up to 18 months. The signage is allowed to be updated throughout the 18 month period without the need for additional RDDC approval provided the updated signs do not exceed 32 square feet each and pertain to the 500 block and its existing and upcoming projects so be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Hackworth seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

7. *Certificate of Appropriateness at the corner of Monument Street and Newton Street to replace the existing parking lot near the fire station by removing the*

barbed wire fencing, curb and gutter, and parking blocks; repairing the existing washed out embankment, installing erosion control measures, and seeding; and installing new curb and gutter with landscaping, parking street lights, and three (3) vehicle charging stations.

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Kelvin Perry, Project Manager of Economic Development. Mr. Perry stated so we have the request here that has been read to you to upgrade and improve the parking lot that is on Monument Street. I believe staff originally sent out none acceptance and we have gone out and we have make the necessary adjustments.

Mr. Davis stated according to Holley you are going to be tearing down the fencing and basically going to be redoing that lot and it's going to be a place that you don't mulch.

Mr. Perry stated its going to be a parking lot used for the Durham Hosiery building, which is under renovations now. There tenants and commercial space that will be there will be utilize as well as public parking.

Mr. Lackey had to leave the meeting at 4:59 pm.

Mr. Davis stated this is not going to be a fenced in area?

Mr. Perry stated no.

Mr. Ranson stated the dumpster screen is it going to just be a black wall painted?

Mr. Perry stated it will be just like Mucho's.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the parking lot, as now presented to staff in this drawing, meets the guidelines and therefore issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Ranson second the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

8. *Certificate of Appropriateness at 119-121 S. Union Street to demolish the existing building and construct a pocket park.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present to behalf of this request was Corrie Bobe. Mrs. Bobe stated once demolition began and engineers began working on a plan we came across a number of issues with the Knights of Pythia's building. We have had several construction crews come in and verify that this is an unsafe structure. One was just in the construction of the building as you go into the basement the structural beams that run through in columns that go to the next floor. The columns are not bearing on one another and they are off set so you already have one structural issue already. They tried to correct that for years by putting columns wherever they could. Fortunately, one set of columns was over a storm water culvert system that ran under the building. The second issue there is damage from multiple past fires in the structure that was never remedied. The structure

is hazardous because of a collapsed culvert in the basement. The building is in danger of falling in and work on the culvert would put a work crew and surrounding buildings at risk. The building will need to be demolished by hand starting at the top, a tedious process. We are requesting permission to demolish this building and demolition will have to be very well planned for the safety of building and pedestrians around it. We would like to install a pocket park within that area that will be used for public and also for the hotel guest.

Mrs. Nicholas stated it will not belong to that hotel but will be accessible by the hotel.

Mrs. Bobe stated that is correct.

Mr. Ranson stated doesn't think affect the financial liability because you are going to have a third less space for rooms and things?

Mrs. Bobe stated now he is in the process of purchasing the building to the left.

Mr. Ranson stated I've gotten some distressed emails and calls from people; the building is significant. I guess my question is if the problem is the culvert can you take some more time and see if there is a solution for that?

Mrs. Bobe stated we have tried and have taken several engineers and construction companies there, that is a reason they are buying the building next door. We have looked at it for several months now and it goes back to everyone seems to think that this creates more of a unsafe structure or a safety issue for the structures around it and the ones that will be working on it. The issue is once you start looking at that culvert it creates a very unsafe scenario.

Mr. Davis stated just looking out the window here you have the three structures together has there ever been a thought to putting steel beams across the top and keeping the roof on there just as part of the historical significance, and also a cover for the park itself?

Mrs. Bobe stated we can look into it but it goes back to cost for steel structures. I have worked with a number of developers and it doesn't generate profit for them but they probably don't want to spend that type of money in keeping a structure. It goes back to if we invest in a pocket park is it worth our while to keep it or spend the money on steel beams in order to keep the roof line or invest in high quality products for the park.

Mrs. Nicholas stated is there a scenario in which the Pythias building is at all salvageable or has it been consist across the board that this can not be saved?

Mrs. Bobe stated the unfortunate thing is because the issues comes from the bottom you can't salvage the structure itself it can collapse. In terms of saving a portion of the structure, we can't guarantee it.

Ms. Christie Wall, owner of Grizzly's Hatchet House, stated I'm just listening to what she was talking about. My question would be if nothing were done what happens. It seems like if the situation is a giant sinkhole near a building it is already collapsing and already sinking in and a decision not made not to do something to it. The whole building could collapse and that is a safety issue.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the request meets the guidelines as presented and they should issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to be demolished and a pocket park to be constructed with the conditions that the City come back to the RDDC for the specifics on the park and that salvable materials are reused in the park or surrounds as able or appropriate. Mr. Hackworth seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

A request was made from the floor to add an item to the agenda. The Commission voted unanimously to add the following item.

Certificate of Appropriateness at 680 Lynn Street, Suite J to create a patio area in the space behind Grizzly's Hatchet House and the brick wall property divider. Add black aluminum fencing, a deck, paved & grass for seating games, uplighting and patio lights.

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on this behalf is Christie Wall, owner of Grizzly's Hatchet House. Ms. Wall stated basically what we want to do is extend outside the back door of our facility it is already a grassy strip behind the building. Just past that is a brick wall that divides the building we want to create a patio where people can go outside and play corn hole and that sort of thing. We have created a design that has a terrace on the Monument street side and it will be level with Monument and it will be just a deck and there will be four or five steps down to the grade that will be even with the back door of Grizzly's. There will be built in seating using plain deck board beside the steps area that will be built in seating and tables in that area. There will be some mobile seating and some swings in the corners. Both sides on the left and right will have fencing we know that the fencing that goes towards Lynn street will be simple black metal picket fence with a exit door only because its level with the street we plan to do something taller what is there now is a chain link if we did chain link it would be black because we want it to blend in. There will be patio lighting also.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so are you asking for iron fence panel or chain fence?

Ms. Wall stated that would definitely be on the side of Lynn Street because you have a long grade that you could actually drive up to that goes to the length of the building. On the left hand side of Monument street that's where we want add the six foot fence so people can't jump over it.

Mrs. Nicholas stated are you saying this or chain link or are you proposing to do some chain link?

Ms. Wall stated chain link on the street side.

Mr. Ranson stated is the Grizzly logo a sign or artwork?

Mr. Gillie stated it is artwork. We were unaware of the chain link fence.

Mrs. Preston stated chain link fencing, is not permitted.

Ms. Wall stated we can definitely do the picket fence. The price is about the same either way so it is fine.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion that the application as presented by Grizzly's Hatchet House and Christie Wall meets the guidelines as presented with the exception that the chain link fence not be allowed but instead the fence panels as shown in the necessary sizes as needed meets the guidelines so therefore should be given a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The April 11, 2018 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

Mrs. Preston stated I have just one quick information item for you. The Fire Marshall has deemed structure unsafe and ordered it to be demolished. It is not the entire structure but portion thereof at 603 Loyal Street. Since they have ordered that it be demolished, it somewhat supersedes the need for this Commissions approval. We bring it to you as an information only so you will know what is going on if you see them out there working.

Mr. Gillie stated it's back of a warehouse behind Bolton's Accounting. You can see where the beam is broken going down the street and it has to come down.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Approved By: